

that in using the phrase, "cost of service," they include not only the actual expense of moving freight, but also "a fair return in interest or dividends on the cost of service." The cost principle would be to the advantage of New-York, it was necessary to prove that the expense of transporting freight between New-York and Chicago was not less than that of transporting it between New-York and Baltimore or New-York and Philadelphia. The Commission, says, "unfortunately, the information that was provided to the Commission was not very precise or very accurate." The Commission was not directed to official reports or figures, where or by which the actual cost was set forth, but rather to the fact that the cost of transportation between New-York and the head of Lake Michigan. The report says that to make out the case of more favorable lines and gradients between New-York and Chicago, the route of the Central must be taken. But New-York has other roads which it is desirable for its interest should live and prosper. The application of the cost principle to the Central route is the most economical, would force the Pennsylvania to either carry business at rates which will not give a fair return in interest or dividends on the cost of service, or to build a new line, the latter of which is also assumed to be less favorable than that of the Central, might be compelled to face the same alternative.

The Commission next take up the assertions of the Baltimore and Philadelphia merchants that the cheapness of the fuel consumed by the Pennsylvania and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroads, and their shorter distances, overbalance the advantages of the more favorable lines of the New-York Central and its affiliated roads. The official figures of the cost of transportation between New-York and the head of Lake Michigan, and the Pennsylvania Railroad make a very unfavorable showing for New-York. But the Commission point out that, for the purpose, the statistics are little or no use.

(1) The trunk-line companies report the cost over their own roads only, and do not include the cost of the cost of transportation over the whole line from Western points to the seaboard.

(2) The companies in their reports do not discriminate between the cost of service to local freight and the cost of service to through freight, and the average cost of moving freight, when it is only the cost of moving through freight which is desired for the construction of the Central, is not the same as the cost of moving local freight. The Commission point out that the value of these statistics is vitiated by the lack of uniformity among the railroads in their method of keeping accounts. The Commission conclude, however, that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

The table shows that the proportion of freight sent out from New-York over these roads, when compared with that which is received from them, is not greater than that of the New-York Central and Philadelphia, and it is nevertheless only as to the cost of a quarter, and it is manifest that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

On the other hand, the application of the cost principle would be to the advantage of New-York, it was necessary to prove that the expense of transporting freight between New-York and Chicago was not less than that of transporting it between New-York and Baltimore or New-York and Philadelphia. The Commission, says, "unfortunately, the information that was provided to the Commission was not very precise or very accurate."

The Commission next take up the assertions of the Baltimore and Philadelphia merchants that the cheapness of the fuel consumed by the Pennsylvania and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroads, and their shorter distances, overbalance the advantages of the more favorable lines of the New-York Central and its affiliated roads. The official figures of the cost of transportation between New-York and the head of Lake Michigan, and the Pennsylvania Railroad make a very unfavorable showing for New-York. But the Commission point out that, for the purpose, the statistics are little or no use.

(1) The trunk-line companies report the cost over their own roads only, and do not include the cost of the cost of transportation over the whole line from Western points to the seaboard.

(2) The companies in their reports do not discriminate between the cost of service to local freight and the cost of service to through freight, and the average cost of moving freight, when it is only the cost of moving through freight which is desired for the construction of the Central, is not the same as the cost of moving local freight. The Commission point out that the value of these statistics is vitiated by the lack of uniformity among the railroads in their method of keeping accounts. The Commission conclude, however, that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

The table shows that the proportion of freight sent out from New-York over these roads, when compared with that which is received from them, is not greater than that of the New-York Central and Philadelphia, and it is nevertheless only as to the cost of a quarter, and it is manifest that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

On the other hand, the application of the cost principle would be to the advantage of New-York, it was necessary to prove that the expense of transporting freight between New-York and Chicago was not less than that of transporting it between New-York and Baltimore or New-York and Philadelphia. The Commission, says, "unfortunately, the information that was provided to the Commission was not very precise or very accurate."

when the railroads have been so conducted as to avoid competitive strife. They trace some of the reasons for this reduction to competitive and others to the fact that the growth of the country's railroad business has kept pace with the reduction of rates. The Commission, however, point out that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

The Commission next take up the assertions of the Baltimore and Philadelphia merchants that the cheapness of the fuel consumed by the Pennsylvania and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroads, and their shorter distances, overbalance the advantages of the more favorable lines of the New-York Central and its affiliated roads. The official figures of the cost of transportation between New-York and the head of Lake Michigan, and the Pennsylvania Railroad make a very unfavorable showing for New-York. But the Commission point out that, for the purpose, the statistics are little or no use.

(1) The trunk-line companies report the cost over their own roads only, and do not include the cost of the cost of transportation over the whole line from Western points to the seaboard.

(2) The companies in their reports do not discriminate between the cost of service to local freight and the cost of service to through freight, and the average cost of moving freight, when it is only the cost of moving through freight which is desired for the construction of the Central, is not the same as the cost of moving local freight. The Commission point out that the value of these statistics is vitiated by the lack of uniformity among the railroads in their method of keeping accounts. The Commission conclude, however, that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

The table shows that the proportion of freight sent out from New-York over these roads, when compared with that which is received from them, is not greater than that of the New-York Central and Philadelphia, and it is nevertheless only as to the cost of a quarter, and it is manifest that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

On the other hand, the application of the cost principle would be to the advantage of New-York, it was necessary to prove that the expense of transporting freight between New-York and Chicago was not less than that of transporting it between New-York and Baltimore or New-York and Philadelphia. The Commission, says, "unfortunately, the information that was provided to the Commission was not very precise or very accurate."

The Commission next take up the assertions of the Baltimore and Philadelphia merchants that the cheapness of the fuel consumed by the Pennsylvania and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroads, and their shorter distances, overbalance the advantages of the more favorable lines of the New-York Central and its affiliated roads. The official figures of the cost of transportation between New-York and the head of Lake Michigan, and the Pennsylvania Railroad make a very unfavorable showing for New-York. But the Commission point out that, for the purpose, the statistics are little or no use.

(1) The trunk-line companies report the cost over their own roads only, and do not include the cost of the cost of transportation over the whole line from Western points to the seaboard.

(2) The companies in their reports do not discriminate between the cost of service to local freight and the cost of service to through freight, and the average cost of moving freight, when it is only the cost of moving through freight which is desired for the construction of the Central, is not the same as the cost of moving local freight. The Commission point out that the value of these statistics is vitiated by the lack of uniformity among the railroads in their method of keeping accounts. The Commission conclude, however, that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

The table shows that the proportion of freight sent out from New-York over these roads, when compared with that which is received from them, is not greater than that of the New-York Central and Philadelphia, and it is nevertheless only as to the cost of a quarter, and it is manifest that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

On the other hand, the application of the cost principle would be to the advantage of New-York, it was necessary to prove that the expense of transporting freight between New-York and Chicago was not less than that of transporting it between New-York and Baltimore or New-York and Philadelphia. The Commission, says, "unfortunately, the information that was provided to the Commission was not very precise or very accurate."

THE STAR ROUTE CASES.

A MORAL VINDICATION IMPOSSIBLE.

EFFECT OF THE DECISION ADMITTING WALSH'S TESTIMONY—MESSRS. JAMES, MACVEIGH AND CLAYTON TO BE CALLED TO THE STAND.

WASHINGTON, July 21.—The admission of Walsh's testimony to-day by Judge Wylie showed how much the case of the Government has been strengthened by his ruling of the other day that there was not enough evidence of a conspiracy to be sent to the jury to be weighed by them. The conspiracy, being assumed, the testimony of Walsh showed to-day, clearly competent, as Judge Wylie showed to-day, not because the confession of one conspirator binds the other conspirator, but because it is good evidence against that conspirator, and evidence against that conspirator is a circumstance tending to show a conspiracy. Judge Wylie said, on the face of the testimony offered, it tended very strongly to prove a conspiracy.

The testimony of ex-Postmaster General James, ex-Attorney General MacVeigh, and ex-Senator Clayton, as to the admissions made to them by the conspirators, is now clearly competent, and the evidence of the two first named is rejected at an earlier stage of the case only because sufficient evidence of a conspiracy had not been submitted to form a foundation for it. Mr. James, Mr. MacVeigh, and Mr. Clayton will probably be put on the stand as soon as Walsh is dismissed.

Whether all this evidence will have any effect on the verdict of the jury remains to be seen; but it is an angry blow to the defense, because it must put an end to their hopes of a "moral vindication" at the hands of the public. It may surprise the world outside of Washington to know that this is one of the things that the Star Route defendants have been contending for, but such is the fact; and if the case had broken down without going to the jury at all, or had closed without the production of any direct evidence that Brady's kingdom of all the combinations—profited by orders made for the purpose of obtaining a moral acquittal, for which the defense would have been grateful.

Walsh's credibility is, of course, open to question; but in situations like these the evidence of a witness is not weighed exactly what the commission was after, as its members had said nothing to him upon that point, a he could not ascertain that they wanted anything further than the truth.

Walsh's testimony, however, is not to be taken as a confession of guilt, but as a statement of the facts as he saw them. The fact that he was a witness to the operations of the Star Route, and that he was a witness to the operations of the Star Route, is not to be taken as a confession of guilt, but as a statement of the facts as he saw them.

On the other hand, the application of the cost principle would be to the advantage of New-York, it was necessary to prove that the expense of transporting freight between New-York and Chicago was not less than that of transporting it between New-York and Baltimore or New-York and Philadelphia. The Commission, says, "unfortunately, the information that was provided to the Commission was not very precise or very accurate."

The Commission next take up the assertions of the Baltimore and Philadelphia merchants that the cheapness of the fuel consumed by the Pennsylvania and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroads, and their shorter distances, overbalance the advantages of the more favorable lines of the New-York Central and its affiliated roads. The official figures of the cost of transportation between New-York and the head of Lake Michigan, and the Pennsylvania Railroad make a very unfavorable showing for New-York. But the Commission point out that, for the purpose, the statistics are little or no use.

(1) The trunk-line companies report the cost over their own roads only, and do not include the cost of the cost of transportation over the whole line from Western points to the seaboard.

(2) The companies in their reports do not discriminate between the cost of service to local freight and the cost of service to through freight, and the average cost of moving freight, when it is only the cost of moving through freight which is desired for the construction of the Central, is not the same as the cost of moving local freight. The Commission point out that the value of these statistics is vitiated by the lack of uniformity among the railroads in their method of keeping accounts. The Commission conclude, however, that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

The table shows that the proportion of freight sent out from New-York over these roads, when compared with that which is received from them, is not greater than that of the New-York Central and Philadelphia, and it is nevertheless only as to the cost of a quarter, and it is manifest that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

On the other hand, the application of the cost principle would be to the advantage of New-York, it was necessary to prove that the expense of transporting freight between New-York and Chicago was not less than that of transporting it between New-York and Baltimore or New-York and Philadelphia. The Commission, says, "unfortunately, the information that was provided to the Commission was not very precise or very accurate."

THE NEW-YORK POST OFFICE.

ITS WORKINGS INVESTIGATED.

OFFICIALLY DECLARED TO BE THE MOST EFFICIENT AND BEST MANAGED IN THE COUNTRY—THE JEALOUSY OF CERTAIN WASHINGTON OFFICIALS.

A commission of three special agents of the Post Office Department—J. E. Stuart, R. D. Adair, and E. A. Clifford—have just made a thorough investigation of the workings of the Post Office in this city for several days, and completing their report yesterday. In view of the recent investigations into the management of the Surveyor's Office, the Appraiser's Department and other Federal offices in this city, believed to have been investigated by certain Stalwart politicians who wanted to get control of the places, a good deal of interest has been created among the same class of individuals by the presence here of this special commission from the Post Office Department. Certain stalwart leaders, who would have the public believe that they speak for the Administration, have been talking loudly in their well-known places of resort about the changes in the Post Office, naming De Witt C. Wheeler as a probable successor of Postmaster Pearson. The names of Joel B. Erhardt and others are also mentioned. Assistant Postmaster General Hutton, who is said to be no admirer of the Civil Service Reform system followed by Postmaster Pearson, has been quoted as making a remark which the politicians thought indicated a coming change here, and hence they were delighted when they heard that a commission was here, as they believed, hunting up evidence upon which to base a pretext for a removal.

A Tribune reporter who made some inquiries yesterday of the Post Office, could find no reason for believing that the commission had any political bearing. Postmaster Pearson said that he had received an order from the Post Office Department to be sent out to investigate the operations of the Post Office at Baltimore, Philadelphia, New-York, Brooklyn, Boston, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and San Francisco. He said that the purpose of the commission was to determine "the necessities of the service." The commission had been authorized every facility for a thorough inquiry into the operations of the Post Office at New-York, and he did not know exactly what the commission was after, as its members had said nothing to him upon that point, a he could not ascertain that they wanted anything further than the truth.

Walsh's testimony, however, is not to be taken as a confession of guilt, but as a statement of the facts as he saw them. The fact that he was a witness to the operations of the Star Route, and that he was a witness to the operations of the Star Route, is not to be taken as a confession of guilt, but as a statement of the facts as he saw them.

Walsh's testimony, however, is not to be taken as a confession of guilt, but as a statement of the facts as he saw them. The fact that he was a witness to the operations of the Star Route, and that he was a witness to the operations of the Star Route, is not to be taken as a confession of guilt, but as a statement of the facts as he saw them.

Walsh's testimony, however, is not to be taken as a confession of guilt, but as a statement of the facts as he saw them. The fact that he was a witness to the operations of the Star Route, and that he was a witness to the operations of the Star Route, is not to be taken as a confession of guilt, but as a statement of the facts as he saw them.

On the other hand, the application of the cost principle would be to the advantage of New-York, it was necessary to prove that the expense of transporting freight between New-York and Chicago was not less than that of transporting it between New-York and Baltimore or New-York and Philadelphia. The Commission, says, "unfortunately, the information that was provided to the Commission was not very precise or very accurate."

The Commission next take up the assertions of the Baltimore and Philadelphia merchants that the cheapness of the fuel consumed by the Pennsylvania and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroads, and their shorter distances, overbalance the advantages of the more favorable lines of the New-York Central and its affiliated roads. The official figures of the cost of transportation between New-York and the head of Lake Michigan, and the Pennsylvania Railroad make a very unfavorable showing for New-York. But the Commission point out that, for the purpose, the statistics are little or no use.

(1) The trunk-line companies report the cost over their own roads only, and do not include the cost of the cost of transportation over the whole line from Western points to the seaboard.

(2) The companies in their reports do not discriminate between the cost of service to local freight and the cost of service to through freight, and the average cost of moving freight, when it is only the cost of moving through freight which is desired for the construction of the Central, is not the same as the cost of moving local freight. The Commission point out that the value of these statistics is vitiated by the lack of uniformity among the railroads in their method of keeping accounts. The Commission conclude, however, that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

The table shows that the proportion of freight sent out from New-York over these roads, when compared with that which is received from them, is not greater than that of the New-York Central and Philadelphia, and it is nevertheless only as to the cost of a quarter, and it is manifest that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

On the other hand, the application of the cost principle would be to the advantage of New-York, it was necessary to prove that the expense of transporting freight between New-York and Chicago was not less than that of transporting it between New-York and Baltimore or New-York and Philadelphia. The Commission, says, "unfortunately, the information that was provided to the Commission was not very precise or very accurate."

OUT-DOOR SPORTS.

THE RACES AT SARATOGA.

SARATOGA, N. Y., July 21.—To-day's excellent programme brought a large assembly of spectators to the track, which was in excellent condition.

First race—Purse \$350, for non-winners in 1882, of which \$50 to second; entrance free; maidens allowed 12 years old, 5 pounds; if 4 years, 10 pounds; if 5 years or upward, 18 pounds; one mile and a furlong. The starters were J. A. Grinstead's Jennie V. (3 years, 95 pounds), P. C. Fox's Granger (4, 115), C. Boyle's Springfield (4, 118), C. Reed's Mammoth (3, 100), T. K. Smith's Hamlet (3, 113), J. J. Jameson & Co.'s Azim (4, 108), O. B. Brown's Colonel Watson (3, 97), C. Leifer's Minnie D. (4, 113), and D. Colazzi's Spark (4, 113). Jennie V. won the race; Springfield second, and Spark third; time, 1:57. The French pools paid \$23.10.

Second race—Purse \$500, for all ages, of which \$100 to second horse; entrance free; beaten and maiden allowances; mile heats. Starters—J. A. Grinstead's Liatuna, 6 years, 105 pounds; Connelly & Co.'s Metropolis (4 years, 113 pounds); Darden & Co.'s Fatima, 4 years, 108 pounds; C. Reed's Bonnie, 5 years, 110 pounds; and O. B. Brown's Azim, 3 years, 97 pounds. The first heat was won by Liatuna; Liatuna second, Bonnie third; time, 1:43. The second heat was won by Fatima; Liatuna second, and Metropolis third; time, 1:44. The French pools paid \$31.80.

Third race—Purse \$300, for two-year-olds; entrance free; selling allowance; five furlongs. Starters—M. J. O'Brien's Major, 2 years, 100 pounds; C. L. Hunt's April Fool, 115 pounds; A. Barnham's Baron, 107 pounds; J. J. Jameson & Co.'s Azim (3 years, 97), C. Leifer's Minnie D. (4, 113), and D. Colazzi's Spark (4, 113). Jennie V. won the race; Springfield second, and Spark third; time, 1:57. The French pools paid \$23.10.

Fourth race—Purse \$350, for all ages, of which \$50 to second horse; entrance free; beaten and maiden allowances; mile heats. Starters—J. A. Grinstead's Liatuna, 6 years, 105 pounds; Connelly & Co.'s Metropolis (4 years, 113 pounds); Darden & Co.'s Fatima, 4 years, 108 pounds; C. Reed's Bonnie, 5 years, 110 pounds; and O. B. Brown's Azim, 3 years, 97 pounds. The first heat was won by Liatuna; Liatuna second, Bonnie third; time, 1:43. The second heat was won by Fatima; Liatuna second, and Metropolis third; time, 1:44. The French pools paid \$31.80.

Walsh's testimony, however, is not to be taken as a confession of guilt, but as a statement of the facts as he saw them. The fact that he was a witness to the operations of the Star Route, and that he was a witness to the operations of the Star Route, is not to be taken as a confession of guilt, but as a statement of the facts as he saw them.

On the other hand, the application of the cost principle would be to the advantage of New-York, it was necessary to prove that the expense of transporting freight between New-York and Chicago was not less than that of transporting it between New-York and Baltimore or New-York and Philadelphia. The Commission, says, "unfortunately, the information that was provided to the Commission was not very precise or very accurate."

The Commission next take up the assertions of the Baltimore and Philadelphia merchants that the cheapness of the fuel consumed by the Pennsylvania and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroads, and their shorter distances, overbalance the advantages of the more favorable lines of the New-York Central and its affiliated roads. The official figures of the cost of transportation between New-York and the head of Lake Michigan, and the Pennsylvania Railroad make a very unfavorable showing for New-York. But the Commission point out that, for the purpose, the statistics are little or no use.

(1) The trunk-line companies report the cost over their own roads only, and do not include the cost of the cost of transportation over the whole line from Western points to the seaboard.

(2) The companies in their reports do not discriminate between the cost of service to local freight and the cost of service to through freight, and the average cost of moving freight, when it is only the cost of moving through freight which is desired for the construction of the Central, is not the same as the cost of moving local freight. The Commission point out that the value of these statistics is vitiated by the lack of uniformity among the railroads in their method of keeping accounts. The Commission conclude, however, that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

The table shows that the proportion of freight sent out from New-York over these roads, when compared with that which is received from them, is not greater than that of the New-York Central and Philadelphia, and it is nevertheless only as to the cost of a quarter, and it is manifest that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

On the other hand, the application of the cost principle would be to the advantage of New-York, it was necessary to prove that the expense of transporting freight between New-York and Chicago was not less than that of transporting it between New-York and Baltimore or New-York and Philadelphia. The Commission, says, "unfortunately, the information that was provided to the Commission was not very precise or very accurate."

and the sheriff had made a levy on judgments aggregating \$50,000.

The families of Morris B. Stroud & Son, manufacturers of cotton goods at Frankfort, Penn., who failed, are now reported at \$250,000, of which \$50,000 is due to New-York. The assets are reported to be about \$190,000.

THE FIRE RECORD.

A BREWERY DESTROYED.

The lager-brewery of Weiss & Mander, at Court-street and Morris-avenue, Newark, was destroyed by fire yesterday. The brewery consisted of a three-story brick building, a two-story brick house and a two-story frame house. The fire originated in the brick house, and spread to the other buildings. All three buildings were completely destroyed, and their contents, as well as a large amount of valuable machinery, were totally destroyed. The loss is estimated at between \$25,000 and \$30,000. There was an insurance of \$30,000 on the buildings and contents. The cause of the fire is unknown. The buildings were owned by Mr. Mander.

LARGE DESTRUCTION OF OIL.

One of the large oil tanks in the Standard Oil Company's Works at Caran Point, New-Jersey, caught fire about 9 o'clock last night, and the reflection from the flames caused an illumination that could be seen for miles around. The works at Caran Point are a branch of the company's works at Constance Hook, and are used for refining purposes exclusively. The tank which was destroyed had a capacity of 5,000 barrels of oil. It had been burning for some time with an adjoining tank, and the fire communicated to an adjoining tank, which was also destroyed. The fire destroyed a large amount of oil, and caused a loss of about \$50,000. The cause of the fire is unknown. The buildings were owned by Mr. Mander.

DAMAGE TO A PLANING MILL.

A fire broke out at 10 o'clock Thursday night in Kaufman Brothers' molding and planing-mill at Nos. 462, 464 and 466 Cherry-st., on the Third floor. The fire was caused by a lamp, and spread to the building, which was a large brick building, and caused a loss of about \$50,000. The cause of the fire is unknown. The buildings were owned by Mr. Mander.

FLAMES IN NASSAU STREET.

A fire broke out in the office of Samuel Ramm, a jeweler, at the second floor of No. 11 Nassau-st., at 10 o'clock, which is a brick and four stories high, is owned by George G. Stables, of New-Jersey, the father of General Daniel E. Stables. It was damaged \$1,000. The loss to the tenants, which is estimated at \$3,000, is a considerable amount. The cause of the fire is unknown. The buildings were owned by Mr. Mander.

On the other hand, the application of the cost principle would be to the advantage of New-York, it was necessary to prove that the expense of transporting freight between New-York and Chicago was not less than that of transporting it between New-York and Baltimore or New-York and Philadelphia. The Commission, says, "unfortunately, the information that was provided to the Commission was not very precise or very accurate."

The Commission next take up the assertions of the Baltimore and Philadelphia merchants that the cheapness of the fuel consumed by the Pennsylvania and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroads, and their shorter distances, overbalance the advantages of the more favorable lines of the New-York Central and its affiliated roads. The official figures of the cost of transportation between New-York and the head of Lake Michigan, and the Pennsylvania Railroad make a very unfavorable showing for New-York. But the Commission point out that, for the purpose, the statistics are little or no use.

(1) The trunk-line companies report the cost over their own roads only, and do not include the cost of the cost of transportation over the whole line from Western points to the seaboard.

(2) The companies in their reports do not discriminate between the cost of service to local freight and the cost of service to through freight, and the average cost of moving freight, when it is only the cost of moving through freight which is desired for the construction of the Central, is not the same as the cost of moving local freight. The Commission point out that the value of these statistics is vitiated by the lack of uniformity among the railroads in their method of keeping accounts. The Commission conclude, however, that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

The table shows that the proportion of freight sent out from New-York over these roads, when compared with that which is received from them, is not greater than that of the New-York Central and Philadelphia, and it is nevertheless only as to the cost of a quarter, and it is manifest that the Central route is not paid to the argument that the cost of service is reduced on the New-York roads by their being able to return a larger volume of freight than the other roads. The Commission quote statistics showing the differences in the freight received and those sent out over the Atlantic seaboard coast line in 1880 and 1881.

On the other hand, the application of the cost principle would be to the advantage of New-York, it was necessary to prove that the expense of transporting freight between New-York and Chicago was not less than that of transporting it between New-York and Baltimore or New-York and Philadelphia. The Commission, says, "unfortunately, the information that was provided to the Commission was not very precise or very accurate."